



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Meeting of July 14, 2016

City Hall Council Chambers * 290 North 100 West Logan, UT 84321 * www.loganutah.org

Minutes of the meeting for the Logan City Planning Commission convened in regular session on Thursday, July 14, 2016. Chairman Davis called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

Planning Commissioners Present: David Butterfield, Amanda Davis, Dave Newman, Tony Nielson, Eduardo Ortiz, Russ Price

Planning Commissioners Excused: Sara Sinclair

Staff Present: Mike DeSimone, Russ Holley, Amber Pollan, Aaron Smith, Kymber Housley, Bill Young, Debbie Zilles

Minutes as written and recorded from the June 23, 2016 meeting were reviewed. Commissioner Price moved that the minutes be approved as submitted. Commissioner Nielson seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

PUBLIC HEARING

PC 16-032 Berntson Estates [Subdivision Permit] Nate Brockbank/Berntson LLC, authorized agent/owner, request a 112-lot residential subdivision on 29.57 acres located at 1200 East 1400 North in the Neighborhood Residential (NR-6) zone; TIN 05-011-0006.

STAFF: Mr. Holley advised that the applicant has requested to continue this project to the meeting of July 28, 2016.

MOTION: Commissioner Price moved to **continue** PC 16-032 to the July 28, 2016 meeting. Commissioner Ortiz seconded the motion.

Moved: Commissioner Price Seconded: Commissioner Ortiz **Passed:** 5-0

Yea: A. Davis, D. Newman, T. Nielson, E. Ortiz, R. Price Nay: Abstain:

Note: Commissioner Butterfield was not in attendance at the time of the vote.

PC 16-029 Bridger Neighborhood Downzone [Zone Change] City of Logan/Jed Willets-Mountainland Developers LLC, authorized agent/owner, request a rezone of Logan Gateway and Royal Point Lot #6 from Mixed Residential High (MR-20) back to Mixed Residential Medium (MR-12) to be consistent with the Bridger neighborhood located at 1650 North 400 West (5.3 acres) and 1354 North 200 West (1.8 acres); TIN 04-081-0014;05-041-0056.

STAFF: Mr. Holley briefly reviewed the request. It is the intent of staff that this project be placed on the Planning Commission project docket and continued every 6 months for the purpose of having a pending ordinance in place for these properties in case a different project is submitted with a higher density or intensity that differs from what was agreed upon with the approved up-zoning associated with these two areas. When Jed Willets project either submits a final plat or the project expires on May 17, 2017, it is the intent of staff to send this Bridger Downzone proposal to the City Council.

MOTION: Commissioner Nielson moved to **continue PC 16-029** to the meeting of November 10, 2016. Commissioner Newman seconded the motion.

Moved: Commissioner Nielson Seconded: Commissioner Newman **Passed:** 5-0

Yea: A. Davis, D. Newman, T. Nielson, E. Ortiz, R. Price Nay: Abstain:

Note: Commissioner Butterfield was not in attendance at the time of the vote.

PC 16-030 Deer Pen Rezone & Subdivision [Zone Change & Subdivision] Logan City, authorized agent/owner, request to rezone 33 acres (Deer Pen) from Public (PUB) to 23.42 acres of Recreation (REC), 8.63 acres of Neighborhood Residential (NR-4), and 1 acre of new public roads. The proposed zoning lines will follow the preliminary plat boundary. The request is also to subdivide the 33 acres of City-owned property into 22 residential building lots on 8.63 acres and 2 residual lots on 23.42 acres to be designated as parks/open space located at the Deer Pen property adjacent to 1500 East and Aspen Drive.

STAFF: Mr. DeSimone explained that Logan City adopted the Hillcrest Neighborhood Plan (HNP) on May 3, 2016. During the Hillcrest Neighborhood Planning process, the City explored the idea of changing the planned use of the Deer Pen property from a future cemetery site to other types of uses, including residential development, park space and formal open space. The HNP included specific recommendations directing that changes to either the Future Land Use Map or the Zoning Map match the subdivision boundaries.

The final Hillcrest Neighborhood Plan included a FLUP amendment changing the plan designation in Deer Pen from Recreation to a combination of Recreation and Detached Residential. The boundaries of the Detached Residential followed the outline of a conceptual 22 lot subdivision on 8-9 acres.

The proposed plat represents the lot layout for the residential development that was reviewed with the Steering Committee and others prior to final plan approval by the Municipal Council. The remaining property containing approximately 23-24 acres will be removed from consideration as a future cemetery and is being planned for a future park and open space uses.

The proposal is to rezone approximately 32 acres from Public (PUB) to 23.42 acres of Recreation (REC) and 8.63 acres of Neighborhood Residential (NR-4). The NR-4 area will be developed with a 22 lot residential subdivision while the areas zoned as Recreation will become formally incorporated into the Logan Parks & Recreation system.

The proposed subdivision is located adjacent to Aspen Drive and 1500 North. The proposal is to create a total of 22 residential lots, eight of which are accessed off of Aspen Drive, five of which are accessed off of 1500 North, and the remaining nine will be accessed from a new cul-de-sac, Sharptail Circle. The lots range from 13,700 - 26,692 SF and are compatible with surrounding neighborhoods. The lots fronting onto Aspen Drive will have some significant slopes to deal with when they are developed. The remaining acreage may be incorporated into one or two additional parcels, or remain as residual acreage.

PUBLIC: Emails from Michael Timmons, Karl & Marjorie Perry, Sherry Funke and Blair Larsen were received and distributed to the Commission for review prior to the meeting.

LuAnn Harris, 1673 East 1080 North, believes the property is more valuable as a future cemetery. She has heard that people who have called in about this area have been told that "decisions have already been made". Speeding, increased traffic and routes of travel through the area are major concerns. 1080 North is a narrow street (especially with cars parked on both sides) that was not built to be a collector road. She requested that this request not be approved until all the problems are solved. Families are affected and should be heard, this does not need to be "rushed through".

Mr. DeSimone noted that surrounding property owners were noticed. Residents were also notified several times during the Hillcrest Plan process. Traffic counts have been done and are minimal along 1500 North.

Joshua Campbell, 1725 East 1080 North, advised there is another access south of Lundstrom Park that is not typically used. His concern is that the additional homes will place an unfair burden on residents live on 1080 North and 1500 North. He suggested a connection to 1350 North, which would allow another direct access point and would create an appropriate balance in moving forward.

Kristi Andersen, 1701 North 1770 East, walks the trail behind Lundstrom Park daily, there are vehicles that come down the hill quite fast. More traffic will compound this problem and she would like to see a speed barrier put in for pedestrian safety.

Greg Podgorski, 1802 East 1700 North, has been involved in the discussions regarding land use for a long time. This seems to be a reasonable compromise; however, he is concerned that unrestricted development of homes will result in incompatibility with the natural landscape of the area. He would like to recommend modest restrictions placed on the type of development (including building mass, height, color, fencing, lighting etc.).

Cyndy Weiss, 1657 East 1080 North, is concerned about the traffic and would like to know what the "number of trips per day" would actually be on 1080 North. Additional traffic impacts the residents and causes concern for the safety of children and pedestrians in the area.

Sherry Funke, 1340 Sagewood, is concerned about driveway access onto Aspen Drive and the steepness of the roads, which is especially problematic in the winter.

Jack Peterson, 1376 Boxwood Circle, believes it is inappropriate for the City to take land purchased for a future cemetery and convert it. He questioned when the City will have a need for more cemetery space and what the acquisition process will involve. He also questioned the expected profit from the development of the area and said it seems ludicrous to consider this option with no financial projection. He would to see the City keep it as it was purchased until there is a definite plan.

Mr. DeSimone noted that the particular strategy regarding selling the entire property to a developer or selling lots individually has not been determined at this point. Russ Akina, the Parks & Recreation Director, has predicted a 50-year capacity for the current cemetery.

Mr. Housley, the City Attorney, advised that Mr. Peterson's questions and concerns are appropriate; however, they are policy questions which would be appropriate for the Mayor and Municipal Council to address and are outside the purview of what the Planning Commission is considering.

Wendy Hurd, 1472 North 1800 East, works for the school district and said Hillcrest Elementary is "bursting at the seams". She would like to see speed addressed on 1500 North and the trail behind Lundstrom Park completed. It seems crazy to put in a development where residents thought it would remain open space.

Jed Pingree, 1639 East 1080 North, thought a future cemetery would be needed in 25 years (not 50). His understanding was that the City paid back the borrowed funds and he does not understand why the City needs the money now. Traffic and speeding is a concern on 1500 North and 1080 North, additional traffic will compound this issue.

Gary Etherington, 1775 East 1350 North, advised that the trail is a great access and agrees with Ms. Andersen about speeding in the area. He also does not want to see an access onto 1350 North.

Mr. DeSimone pointed out that when Deer Crest was originally approved there was a proposed connection to 1350 North (to the east) which went through an appeals process and was pulled out of the plan. Traffic concerns have been considered as part of this project.

COMMISSION: Mr. DeSimone answered for Commissioner Price that the proposed park is formally incorporated into the Lundstrom Park area and will be included in the Parks Master Plan.

Chairman Davis asked if this proposal was the “middle” proposal of the three that were included in the Hillcrest Plan. Mr. DeSimone explained that this proposal is a variation of that plan. After looking at the site more intensively, the idea is to achieve valuable lot sites without destroying the integrity of the area. This proposal will make use of existing roadways and infrastructure. Staff feels that this plan is a fair compromise.

Commissioner Newman asked about the motivating factor for development of this area. Mr. DeSimone explained that the property was initially purchased with cemetery funds; however, it has been determined that there is no immediate need for a cemetery; therefore, the decision to sell the property to repay the money was made. The school district has indicated the need for more single-family homes in the area. The property could allow up to 80 homes, however, the City chose not to develop that intensively and believes this is a good compromise. There is still open space further east (Bonneville Trail) that people can enjoy.

Chairman Davis asked if there would be a guarantee that the open spaces will not be developed. Mr. DeSimone explained that there is never a guarantee that property will not change, however, the Mayor and City Council agree with the concept of having passive open space. Once it is formalized there is a minimal chance that it would be developed differently.

Chairman Davis asked about driveway accesses and slope issues. Mr. DeSimone explained that the proposed lots will front onto Aspen Drive. There may be some challenges with the design and/or layout; however those issues would be addressed during the building stage. The lot on the corner will not access directly onto the roundabout and the proposed cul-de-sac will access onto 1500 North. Engineering will identify and address issues as the project progresses.

Commissioner Price asked about the appropriateness of the Commission considering restrictive covenants (as Mr. Podgorski suggested). Mr. Housley explained that if it is a private developer the City would not have that purview, however, because this is City-owned property, the City could voluntarily place restrictive covenants. He said the Commission could recommend that the City Council consider this issue.

Chairman Davis asked about the lots to the east for potential homes. Mr. DeSimone said there are approximately 80-90 lots.

Commissioner Ortiz asked about the increased traffic, specifically related to use of the open space area. Mr. DeSimone said that traffic may increase; however, the idea is to have a trail around the perimeter of the open space that links to the Bonneville Shoreline Trail.

Mr. Housley pointed out that principally this is no different than any other area in the City. If traffic becomes a problem, it will have to be remedied (as it would be anywhere in the City).

Mr. DeSimone noted that the City recognizes the need for changes/improvement to be made to the crossing on 1500 North (for the trail). Speeding cannot be addressed at this level; however, the Municipal Council can address concerns with the Police Department.

MOTION: Commissioner Price moved to **recommend approval** to the Municipal Council for a rezone of approximately 32 acres from Public (PUB) to 23.42 acres of Recreation (REC) and 8.63 acres of Neighborhood Residential (NR-4) as outlined in PC 16-030. Commissioner Ortiz seconded the motion.

Commissioner Newman questioned the timing for this proposal. There is already area available for homes to be built and additional traffic is a concern. Mr. DeSimone advised that the Mayor and Council have decided to move forward with this project and have directed staff to develop a compromised plan for the area. If there are valid reasons why this might not make sense, those discussions can be had, but whether the decision is right or wrong, is outside the Commission's purview.

Commissioner Price pointed out that there has been quite a bit of work completed, given the policy decisions that have been made and with the amount of planned development in the area, the addition of 22 proposed lots does not seem to be incompatible and there does not seem to be a valid reason to deny the zone change request.

Commissioner Nielson advised that given the various scenarios for the area, this seems to be a fair compromise. He appreciates the open space but does have concerns regarding traffic.

Commissioner Butterfield arrived at the meeting and abstained from a vote because he was not in attendance for the discussion.

Moved: Commissioner Price Seconded: Commissioner Ortiz Passed: 4-1

Yea: A. Davis, T. Nielson, E. Ortiz, R. Price Nay: D. Newman Abstain: D. Butterfield

Commissioner Price said he would like to see the Mayor and Council carefully consider the idea of restrictive covenants with input from residents. It is difficult to know what would be reasonable and he does not think the Commission should make those judgments. A private developer would have a market-driven reason to make those decisions.

Mr. DeSimone said the City's desire is to sell the area as a package to a private developer. The City's Land Development Code has appropriate standards that will need to be followed.

Commissioner Newman said he would like a clear understanding regarding the "two residual lots for future park space". Mr. DeSimone explained that the intent is for that area to be an open space area (whether one or two lots).

Chairman Davis noted that she struggles, from a property rights standpoint, telling people what their property should look like. Although the homes should be compatible, she does not believe that it is within the Commission's purview to place restrictive covenants. Commissioner Price said he sees this as a special case because of the long-standing understanding that this property would be a cemetery. The decision to change that plan has created some "mistrust" with the neighbors and this would be one way to soften the scenario.

Commissioner Ortiz felt that this might be a good way to work with the community and help create something that is compatible with the neighborhood. Mr. DeSimone said from a policy standpoint, the City does not enforce, or become involved in, private CC&Rs (design covenants, conditions and restrictions). This will be a market-driven decision by the developer to create compatible lots.

Mr. Housley pointed out that not all CC&Rs are created equal – there are some personal aesthetic decisions such as color and fencing, however, potential impact issues such as height and size might be appropriate. He advised that the Commission could include a recommendation to Council to look at the potential of a CC&R.

Commissioner Newman commended the Hillcrest resident's participation in the process. He is not against this proposal, however, is concerned that the residents opinions were solicited "with an implication that what was desired would be done". The majority of residents indicated a desire to keep the entire area as open space. He strongly suggested that for future plans, wording regarding public opinion be changed to not indicate a perceived implication.

Mr. DeSimone pointed out that when the Council makes a decision, it is for the entire City, not one particular area. There was a concerted effort to notify all residents on multiple occasions to become involved in process. Never was it said that opinions would be what was done – time and ideas were valuable to the process and were considered in the decisions and compromises that were made.

MOTION: Commissioner Price moved to **conditionally approve** a Subdivision Permit, creating 22 residential lots and two residual lots for future park space as outlined in PC 16-030 with the conditions of approval as listed below including a recommendation to consider further neighborhood input for potential restrictive covenants. Commissioner Ortiz seconded the motion.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. All standard conditions of approval will be recorded with the Subdivision Permit and are available in the Community Development Department.
2. 22 residential building lots are approved with this subdivision permit. The residual acreage may be included as additional non-buildable lots or remain as is.
3. The final plat shall be recorded within one (1) year of this action or comply with LDC 17.58 Expirations and Extensions of Time.
4. Prior to recording of a Final Plat or issuance of a Building Permit, the Director of Community Development shall receive a written memorandum from the following departments indicating that their requirement has been satisfied:
 - a. Engineering
 - i. Coordinate with Deer Crest Subdivision owner(s) for connection of sewer to sewer main in 1700 North. This was considered a private line during the development of the Deer Crest Subdivision due to not being located in a City road
 - ii. Stormwater detention/retention to be modified to accommodate the new MS4 requirements of the 90th percentile storm
 - iii. Development shall incorporate LID post-construction best management practices per the new MS4 stormwater permit
 - iv. Plat shall show all steep hazard areas as defined by the Land Development Code. Special reviews and approvals shall be required by Public Works and Building Department prior to any building permits being issued to ensure a safe building site and access to parcels affected by this hazard
 - v. Provide 50' drainage easement through north drainage channel (this is located between the cul-de-sac lots and the existing Phase II Deer Crest Subdivision)
 - vi. Design of City infrastructure (roads, curb, gutter, sidewalks, water, sewer, and stormwater shall be submitted and approved prior to final recordation of plat
 - b. Water/Cross Connection
 - i. All water meter setters must have current Logan City approved check valves in the water meter setters.
 - ii. Any irrigation systems from culinary water must have high-hazard backflow protection and be tested.

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. The subdivision is compatible with surrounding land uses and will not interfere with the use and enjoyment of adjacent properties as the subdivision meets the minimum requirements of the Land Development Code (LDC).
2. Each lot conforms to the requirements of LDC Title 17 in terms of lot size and development requirements.

3. Each lot is suitable for development within the NR-4 zone.
4. The project conforms to the requirements of Title 17.47 concerning hearings, procedures, application requirements and plat preparations.
5. The project meets the goals and objectives of the Logan General Plan and the Hillcrest Neighborhood Plan.
6. The project met the minimum public noticing requirements of the Land Development Code and the Municipal Code.

Moved: Commissioner Price Seconded: Commissioner Ortiz **Passed:** 4-2
Yea: D. Butterfield, T. Nielson, E. Ortiz, R. Price Nay: A. Davis, D. Newman Abstain:

PC 16-031 LDC Amendment – 17.46, 17.47 & 17.62 [Code Amendment] Logan City requests to amend the Land Development Code (LDC) Chapters 17.46, 17.47 & 17.62 to define minor subdivisions and the review process for minor subdivisions.

STAFF: Mr. DeSimone reviewed the proposal to amend the subdivision review process to provide an administrative review track for minor subdivisions involving three (3) or fewer lots without any new road construction. The intent is to review these types of minor actions administratively rather than sending them through the Planning Commission process. This proposal is similar to the Track 1 versus Track 2 Design Review Permit process and would help streamline the smaller, less controversial types of activities while reducing costs associated with this type of project review. The one difference is that the public notice component was not eliminated, so the City will still notify surrounding property owners of the pending subdivision. This proposal does not modify or eliminate any of the existing subdivision or access standards.

The proposed amendment to Section 17.47 includes the proposed language changes:

§17.47.040 Minor Subdivisions: The Director shall be the review authority for Minor Subdivisions and shall review applications according to Section 17.54.

- A. Minor Subdivisions shall meet the following:
 1. The total number of lots being created shall not exceed three (3);
 2. A minor subdivision shall not involve a division of land requiring the construction of a new roadway;
 3. The Director may refer minor subdivision applications to the Planning Commission (Track 2) at his or her discretion where the application does not clearly demonstrate compliance with the applicable standards and criteria of Title 17; and
 4. The application for a minor subdivision shall meet the application and approval criteria in this Chapter.
- B. Mailed Notice. Within ten (10) calendar days of receipt of a complete application, the Director shall send by first class mail a written notice to owners of real property as shown on the latest official County assessor's rolls within three hundred feet of the perimeter boundaries of the subject property. This notice shall be in addition to any other requirements as specified by Utah law. The notice shall include:
 1. The case number and the project's title;
 2. The project's address;
 3. The name of the proponent;
 4. The type of project or projects, including an identification of all types of actions required;
 5. The project description;
 6. The anticipated decision date;
 7. A statement explaining when and where interested persons can obtain information;
 8. The name and direct phone number of the staff member assigned to review the application; and
 9. An explanation on how to file an appeal of the decision.

- C. Appeals shall be heard by the Land Use Appeal Board following the provisions of Chapter 17.57.
- D. The Administrative Record of Decision shall serve as the administrative record of proceedings.

The changes to 17.46 clarify who is responsible for which type of subdivision review while changes to 17.62 add a definition of Minor Subdivision.

PUBLIC: None

COMMISSION: Mr. DeSimone clarified for Commissioner Price that no sections are being eliminated; this is just streamlining the process for simple applications.

Commissioner Butterfield asked what the net affect for a developer would be. Mr. DeSimone said that it would be saving a developer time and money.

MOTION: Commissioner Newman moved to **recommend approval** to the Municipal Council for an amendment to the Land Development Code (LDC) Chapters 17.46, 17.47 & 17.62 as outlined in PC 16-031 with the findings as listed below. Commissioner Nielson seconded the motion.

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. Utah State Law authorizes local Planning Commission to recommend ordinance changes to the legislative body (Municipal Council).
2. The amendment is in conformance with the requirements of Logan Municipal Code Title 17.51.
3. The amendment provides an alternative method for reviewing minor subdivisions where the impact to adjoining private properties or public infrastructure is determined to be relatively minor.
4. The proposal would only apply to subdivisions involving three (3) or fewer lots involving no new road construction.
5. The provision of an alternative review process is consistent with the City's desire to streamline the regulatory review processes in order to help reduce the time and expenses associated with regulatory compliance.
6. The proposed minor subdivision review process does not eliminate or modify any existing subdivision or access standard, nor does it eliminate or reduce the level of public notification.
7. The provisions of this amendment are consistent with the overall goals and objectives of the Logan General Plan.
8. No public comment has been received regarding the proposed amendment.

Moved: Commissioner Newman Seconded: Commissioner Nielson **Passed:** 6-0

Yea: D. Butterfield, A. Davis, D. Newman, T. Nielson, E. Ortiz, R. Price Nay: Abstain:

PC 16-033 South Gateway – Code/FLUP Amendment & Rezone [Code/FLUP Amendment & Rezone] Logan City request to amend the Land Development Code (LDC) Section 17.28 defining the South Gateway Overlay Zone and rezone 68 parcels from Gateway (GW) to Industrial Park (IP), Commercial (COM) and Recreation (REC). The request would also amend the Future Land Use Plan (FLUP) Map to replace Gateway with Industrial, Commercial and Recreation and includes designating and zoning Trapper Park as Recreation on the FLUP and Zoning maps.

STAFF: Mr. DeSimone reviewed the request to amend the designations of 70 parcels of property from Gateway or Rural Reserve to Industrial, Commercial, or Recreation, rezone the same parcels from Gateway to Industrial, Commercial, or Recreation, and amend the LDC to create a South Gateway Overlay Zone to replace the Gateway Zone along Hwy 89/91. The South Gateway Overlay would originate at the UPRR right-of-way (east of 1700 S) southwest along SR 89/91 to the 2200 South intersection, and would extend 300' from either side of the highway. The proposed FLUP and Zone changes also include Trapper Park which was recently annexed into Logan City.

The purpose of this request is to move away from a broad “zone” based approach and toward a performance or design based approach unique to each specific gateway. One of the challenges with the current Gateway zone is that the range of uses are very limited, and because the current Gateway zone extends several thousands of feet away from the highway, there is a negative impact on properties that have no bearing on the features and/or functions of the actual gateway. The proposed method provides better standards within those specific areas that are deemed important to the gateway while allowing properties further away from the corridor to develop within the parameters of a more appropriate zone.

The West Gateway Overlay Zone (Ordinance # 13-080) was adopted by the City on November 12, 2013. The Planning Commission reviewed and approved a proposal for the South Gateway Overlay Zone on September 26, 2013; however, it stalled with the Municipal Council as we were directed to work with Nibley City on implementing the South Corridor Plan. These discussions have been slow with minimal progress. The proposal currently before the Planning Commission scales back the original South Gateway Overlay Zone by excluding those parcels south of 2200nd South until we can reach an agreement with Nibley City on the South Corridor Plan and potentially on adjusting our mutual jurisdictional boundary.

According to Section 17.16.030.E, the purpose of the Gateway concept is to develop aesthetically pleasing, high quality, and economically functional highway entrances to the City. According to the Land Development Code, corporate campuses, recreational uses and open space will be the primary uses found in most Gateways. Gateway development and design standards are intended to accomplish the following:

1. Attractive buildings with large setbacks from primary roadways, highlighted by gracious landscapes or natural areas.
2. Preservation of open spaces and vistas in order to reinforce the picturesque setting of Cache Valley.
3. Preservation and restoration of natural areas.
4. High-quality site and building designs that convey Logan's identity as “a place you want to call home”.
5. Multiple transportation options including safe and efficient circulation for pedestrians, bicyclists, trucks, transit, and other motor vehicles in a well planned network of primary and secondary roadways and multi-use (pedestrian and bicycle) paths.

The South Gateway Overlay adheres to these principles by implementing current design standards, requiring enhanced setbacks, landscaping and screening, and limiting the range of uses within the overlay area. The proposed overlay applies to the most critical area of the gateway, the area adjacent to the roadway, rather than properties away from the highway.

The South Gateway is the most heavily traveled gateway into Logan City and is currently home to a variety of different uses, some of which are highway-related commercial uses. The South Gateway is located within the South Corridor Development Plan adopted by the City in 2013, which is a long-term plan to move new development away from the highway, consolidate commercial uses in commercial nodes around the major intersections, manage highway access from individual properties, and facilitate the flow of through traffic while protecting the significant views within the corridor. The South Gateway concept is consistent with the South Corridor Development Plan as it intensively zones the lands around the 1000 West/Hwy 89/91 intersection, a commercial node identified in the South Corridor Plan, and includes greater setbacks, limits certain uses from locating along this roadway, and works to control individual access onto the highway. The properties considered for rezone from Gateway to other zones are also located around the 1000 West/SR 89/91 and the Park Avenue/SR 89/91 intersections. These areas have been historically zoned either commercial or industrial and have been partially developed as such. With the application of enhanced setbacks, screening and landscaping requirement, the range of uses listed for each zone are appropriate for the targeted areas.

The proposed amendment language in Section 17.28 defines the overlay zone's boundary, the general site design and development standards, and the range of permitted and/or prohibited uses. The Planning Commission will need to evaluate the range of permitted uses in each of the zones to determine whether the uses are appropriate within the gateway

Staff finds that the proposed amendments will enable Logan City and landowners within the gateway corridors to explore a wider range of different land uses with more of a focus on site design, building form and building design rather than limiting the range of uses to a point where very little is permitted.

PUBLIC: Holly Daines asked for clarification on the graphic showing 300'. Mr. DeSimone explained that the overlay is a 300' width from the corridor with the actual setback being 100'. Ms. Daines asked what would be controlled between the 100' setback and the 300' overlay. Mr. DeSimone said any limitations, conditions and uses would be required within the overlay area. The concept is to control the boundaries around the south corridor.

COMMISSION: Commissioner Price asked about a future commercial node at 2200 or 2600 South and expressed concern with making any decisions until that is determined. Mr. DeSimone explained that the City is in discussions with Nibley City and UDOT about formally identifying that node (which will likely be near CampSaver).

Commissioner Butterfield asked if this decision should wait until discussions with Nibley are formalized. Mr. DeSimone explained that this is a policy decision from the Mayor and Council. This amendment may help to gain some resolution and resolve issues with possible future development.

Commissioner Price asked if this could be used in other gateway areas. Mr. DeSimone said this can be reviewed and implemented in other locations as necessary.

MOTION: Commissioner Nielson moved to **recommend approval** to the Municipal Council for an amendment to the Future Land Use Plan (FLUP) and Land Development Code (LDC) Section 17.28 and rezone of the identified parcels as outlined in PC 16-033 with the findings as listed below. Commissioner Newman seconded the motion.

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. Utah State Law authorizes local Planning Commission to recommend ordinance changes to the legislative body (Municipal Council).
2. The amendment is in conformance with the requirements of Logan Municipal Code Title 17.51.
3. The amendment establishes a new Gateway Overlay Zone for the south gateway.
4. The amendment will enable Logan City and landowners within the southern gateway to focus on specific site design and building form/design considerations as a means to enhance the gateway experience; rather than utilize use as the primary criteria to enhance the gateway.
5. The provisions of this Gateway Overlay Zone do not alter the permitted or prohibited uses of the underlying base zone unless specifically identified in the proposed LDC text.
6. The provision of a Gateway Overlay Zone is consistent with the overall goals and objectives of the Logan General Plan as it seeks to provide a mechanism for protecting and enhancing the City's five gateway areas.
7. The provision of this specific Gateway Overlay Zone is consistent with the South Corridor Development Plan.
8. No public comment has been received regarding the proposed hospital overlay zone.
9. The map amendments and rezone includes the Trapper Park property which was recently annexed into Logan City without an underlying land use designation or zoning designation.

Moved: Commissioner Nielson Seconded: Commissioner Newman Passed: 6-0
Yea: D. Butterfield, A. Davis, D. Newman, T. Nielson, E. Ortiz, R. Price Nay: Abstain:

WORKSHOP ITEMS for July 28, 2016

- ✓ PC 16-034 Quayle Meadows Subdivision

Meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Minutes approved as written and digitally recorded for the Logan City Planning Commission meeting of July 14, 2016.

Michael A. DeSimone
Community Development Director

Amanda Davis
Planning Commission Chairman

Russ Holley
Senior Planner

Amber Pollan
Senior Planner

Debbie Zilles
Administrative Assistant